



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,033	03/28/2002	Markus Antonietti	HUBR-1202	8924
24972	7590	09/07/2004	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP			YOON, TAE H	
666 FIFTH AVE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198			PAPER NUMBER	

1714

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/030,033	Applicant(s) ANTONIETTI ET AL.	
	Examiner Tae H. Yoon	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27, 30 and 32-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27, 30, 32-34 and 37-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 35 and 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 38-40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 38 recites (currently amended), but does not show any underlined amendment. Claim 39 improperly broadens the scope of claim 22 wherein a disperse phase of a polar reactant in a continuous apolar organic phase is recited. Claim 40 is redundant in view of the amended claim 22 and cancellation is suggested. Claim 43 is dependent on the canceled claim 29.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 23, 37, 38, 40-46 and 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linehan et al (US 5,770,172).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record and following response.

Contrary to applicant's assertion, Linehan et al teach an inorganic polymerization in microemulsion system comprising a polar liquid in a non-polar liquid in abstract and examples as pointed out by the examiner.

Claims 45-47, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Candau et al (US 4,521,317).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record and following response.

Candau et al teach the use of water as discussed in the last office action. Besides, the instant claims do not specify exact amount of water other than a stabilizing amount and Candau et al stabilized emulsions meeting the instant invention (and the amount of water recited in claim 22 is based on the whole system, and not on water and nonaqueous fluid dispersing medium only as asserted by applicant).

Claims 45-47, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kozakiewicz et al (US 5,037,881).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record and following response.

Kozakiewicz et al teach the use of water as discussed in the last office action. Besides, the instant claims do not specify exact amount of water other than a stabilizing amount and Kozakiewicz et al stabilized emulsions meeting the instant invention (and the amount of water recited in claim 22 is based on the whole system, and not on water and nonaqueous fluid dispersing medium only as asserted by applicant). Particle size of 20-400 nm (10 Å equals 1 nm) is taught at col. 4, lines 31-32.

Claims 22-27, 30, 32-34, 43-52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jenkins et al (US 5,739,378) in view of Kozakiewicz et al (US 5,037,881) or GB 2 118 200.

Rejection is maintained for reason of record and following response.

Note that GB 2 118 200 has replaced Linehan et al (US 5,770,172) and said GB 2 118 200 teaches the art well known nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization in examples.

The use of water and surfactant in oil-in-water and water-in-oil nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization is the art well known practice. Polar reactants would need an apolar organic phase and apolar reactants would need a polaa organic phase since reactants and dispersing medium must be immiscible. Again, the recited amount of water is based on the whole system, and not on water and nonaqueous fluid dispersing medium only as asserted by applicant.

Claims 22-24, 40, 44-47, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over GB 2 118 200.

GB teaches the instant nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization in example 3. The use of a polar monomer such as acrylic acid is taught at page 1, line 23. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 45-47, 51, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 06-157668.

JP teaches the instant nonaqueous miniemulsion polymerization in example 1. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 35 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


Art Unit: 1714

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Tae H Yoon  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

THY/September 2, 2004